

Syllabus

PSCI 7151: American Subnational Politics and Government

Wednesday 2:00-4:30

Spring 2021

Prof. Kenneth Bickers
Office Hours: 10:00-11 M/Th, and by appt.

Office: Zoom
Phone: 303-492-2363
Email: kenneth.bickers@colorado.edu

Course Description

The United States is a fascinating laboratory in which to study democratic governance. The framers of the American constitution forged what James Madison called a “compound republic.” In essence, the constitution sought to construct a system that would embody both effective national governance and energetic state and local governments. The United States continues to be a land of many governments, not just one. While there is just one national government, there are fifty state governments plus the District of Columbia, and as of the most recent Census of Governments 3031 counties, 19,495 municipal governments, 16,253 townships, 12,754 independent school districts, and 38,542 special districts – in total, over 90 thousand governments. This is a lot of government.

Throughout its history, the institutional structures of American governance have been argued about, fought over, and molded to embody differing models of democratic governance. Today, once again, important arguments are being advanced about the roles that the national government should play vis-à-vis state and local governments in the economy and society. How strong should the national government be? What policy responsibilities should be allocated to federal, state, and local governments? How effective are different levels and types of government? How much choice should people living in particular states and locales have over the kinds of collective goods and services available to them? How much equality should result from government policies? What limits, if any, should be imposed on government and the governed?

Political scientists studying American politics tend to theorize about and empirically examine pieces of this puzzle. In this seminar, we will attempt to explore the puzzle as a whole, as well as many of its constituent pieces. One of our main tasks will be to see how these pieces fit together into the larger project of thinking about governance in a compound republic. Broadly, this seminar focuses on the constitution of order and policy provision in the institutionally complex environment of American governance.

At the heart of this seminar is the recognition that human communities create institutions to solve collective action problems that emerge from living and working in proximity to one another. Some of these institutions are formal and rule-based and some are comprised of informal understandings, norms, and conventions. Institutions range from the large-scale level incorporating nation-states and even international arrangements down to extremely localized arrangements often arising from ongoing face-to-face exchanges. Part of the complexity in analyzing these institutions arises from how institutions are nested partially within one another,

as with neighborhoods and school districts that are nested at least in part within cities, which in turn are sometimes nested within and across states and within the national government and beyond. Consequently, a major goal of the seminar is to provide an exposure to theoretical tools for analyzing policy choices and outcomes within the context of the rich institutional complexity of the American political system. Operationally, this seminar is designed to immerse students in literatures on American federalism, devolution, institutional analysis, agency theory, policy subsystems, functional assignment and policy performance within polycentric governmental structures.

Course Organization

This course is designed as a seminar. The success of a seminar depends on diligent, prior preparation of each student. Requirements for the course include class participation, discussion leadership, short weekly memos, a literature review paper, an oral and written critique, and a grant proposal.

Students are expected to read assignments carefully and to come to class prepared to discuss them in some detail. For each class meeting, students should be prepared to offer a summary of the most important arguments discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the research approach covered in that week's readings. A key question to ask of each reading is what insights does the approach entailed in the reading allow us to see that might otherwise be unnoticed. Students should also be prepared to make specific connections to readings covered in previous weeks.

Each week, students will be responsible for preparing a short memo (about one page) that comments on an important aspect of the week's readings. In other words, do not simply summarize the readings. You should raise connections to insights from the readings about behaviors or phenomena on which the readings might shed light. These memos should be uploaded to Canvas by noon of our class meeting. I will set the parameters in Canvas so that the memos are available to all of you by the beginning of each class.

Additionally, each student will be responsible for leading the discussion of the assigned readings one week during the semester. Discussion leaders should prepare a set of questions that will elicit an insightful discussion involving *all* the students in the seminar. In general, the content and order of questions should be flexible, so that the discussion of the material flows in a natural and organic way. At the same time, discussion leaders should remember that their role is that of leader; thus they should maintain a progression through the questions that will allow a reasonably comprehensive discussion of the materials.

During the semester, each student will be expected to prepare a literature review on one of the topics that we will be examining. The literature review is intended as an opportunity to jump ahead with one of the key components of the major assignment in the course, discussed below. The idea is to complete the literature review early enough to get meaningful feedback that is timely. These literature reviews should be approximately 8-10 pages in length. Early in the semester, a sign-up sheet will be distributed for each student to select a topic to address in his or her literature review. In general, the papers should provide the theoretical underpinnings for a research question that you will (or might) undertake. That means you should use this

opportunity to summarize the theoretical arguments contained in the literature on this issue, compare these to other arguments drawn from the literature, and carefully discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments, as they point toward a question that is important to be answered empirically.

Another objective of the course is to provide students with an opportunity to initiate an original research project on a topic relating to an issue arising from the structure of subnational governance. As part of this, students will be expected to prepare a well-reasoned, carefully constructed grant proposal that you *could* or *might* execute at a later point in time. These proposals should follow, as precisely as possible, the grant proposal guidelines for NSF doctoral dissertation grants in Political Science as described on the NSF web site,

https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=505214.

To assist in the refinement of these grant proposals, the course will culminate in a mini-conference in which each student will present a draft of his or her proposed research project and have it critiqued by three of the other students in the seminar. If non-socially distanced in-person learning is feasible toward the end of the semester, the conference will be held at my house. Otherwise, we will conduct the mini-conference via zoon. While informal, the delivery and critique of the grant proposals is an important and integral component of the course. A final draft of the proposal, incorporating revisions suggested by the critiques, will be due a few days after the mini-conference.

The course grade will be comprised of five components: participation and weekly memos 15%, discussion leadership 10%, literature review 25%, critiques 10%, and final draft of grant proposal 40%.

University Policies – Required Syllabus Statements

Classroom Behavior. Both students and faculty are responsible for maintaining an appropriate learning environment in all instructional settings, whether in person, remote or online. Those who fail to adhere to such behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to individuals and topics dealing with race, color, national origin, sex, pregnancy, age, disability, creed, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, veteran status, political affiliation or political philosophy. For more information, see the policies on classroom behavior and the Student Code of Conduct.

Requirements for COVID-19. As a matter of public health and safety due to the pandemic, all members of the CU Boulder community and all visitors to campus must follow university, department and building requirements, and public health orders in place to reduce the risk of spreading infectious disease. Required safety measures at CU Boulder relevant to the classroom setting include:

- maintain 6-foot distancing when possible,
- wear a face covering in public indoor spaces and outdoors while on campus consistent with state and county health orders,

- clean local work area,
- practice hand hygiene,
- follow public health orders, and
- if sick and you live off campus, do not come onto campus (unless instructed by a CU Healthcare professional), or if you live on-campus, please alert [CU Boulder Medical Services](#).

Students who fail to adhere to these requirements will be asked to leave class, and students who do not leave class when asked or who refuse to comply with these requirements will be referred to [Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution](#). For more information, see the policies on [COVID-19 Health and Safety](#) and [classroom behavior](#) and the [Student Code of Conduct](#). If you require accommodation because a disability prevents you from fulfilling these safety measures, please see the “Accommodation for Disabilities” statement on this syllabus. All students who are new to campus must complete the [COVID-19 Student Health and Expectations Course](#). Before coming to campus each day, all students are required to complete the [Buff Pass](#).

Students who have tested positive for COVID-19, have symptoms of COVID-19, or have had close contact with someone who has tested positive for or had symptoms of COVID-19 must stay home. In this class, if you are sick with COVID-19 or any other illness, please be in contact with me when able so that I can help arrange suitable class-related accommodations during your illness.

Accommodation for Disabilities. If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit your accommodation letter from Disability Services to your faculty member in a timely manner so that your needs can be addressed. Disability Services determines accommodations based on documented disabilities in the academic environment. Information on requesting accommodations is located on the [Disability Services website](#). Contact Disability Services at 303-492-8671 or dsinfo@colorado.edu for further assistance. If you have a temporary medical condition, see [Temporary Medical Conditions](#) on the Disability Services website.

Preferred Student Names and Pronouns. CU Boulder recognizes that students' legal information doesn't always align with how they identify. Students may update their preferred names and pronouns via the student portal; those preferred names and pronouns are listed on instructors' class rosters. In the absence of such updates, the name that appears on the class roster is the student's legal name.

Honor Code. All students enrolled in a University of Colorado Boulder course are responsible for knowing and adhering to the Honor Code. Violations of the policy may include: plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, lying, bribery, threat, unauthorized access to academic materials, clicker fraud, submitting the same or similar work in more than one course without permission from all course instructors involved, and aiding academic dishonesty. All incidents of academic misconduct will be reported to the Honor Code (honor@colorado.edu); 303-492-5550). Students found responsible for violating the academic integrity policy will be subject to nonacademic sanctions from the Honor Code as well as academic sanctions from the faculty member.

Additional information regarding the Honor Code academic integrity policy can be found at the [Honor Code Office website](#).

Sexual Misconduct, Discrimination, Harassment and/or Related Retaliation. The University of Colorado Boulder (CU Boulder) is committed to fostering an inclusive and welcoming learning, working, and living environment. CU Boulder will not tolerate acts of sexual misconduct (harassment, exploitation, and assault), intimate partner violence (dating or domestic violence), stalking, or protected-class discrimination or harassment by members of our community. Individuals who believe they have been subject to misconduct or retaliatory actions for reporting a concern should contact the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance (OIEC) at 303-492-2127 or cureport@colorado.edu. Information about the OIEC, university policies, [anonymous reporting](#), and the campus resources can be found on the [OIEC website](#). Please know that faculty and graduate instructors have a responsibility to inform OIEC when made aware of incidents of sexual misconduct, dating and domestic violence, stalking, discrimination, harassment and/or related retaliation, to ensure that individuals impacted receive information about options for reporting and support resources.

Religious Holidays. Campus policy regarding religious observances requires that faculty make every effort to deal reasonably and fairly with all students who, because of religious obligations, have conflicts with scheduled exams, assignments or required attendance. In this class, please notify me at least two weeks prior to the date of the religious observance to allow time for an accommodation to be made. Please see the [campus policy regarding religious observances](#) for full details.

Required Readings

Following is the set of books that you should acquire for this semester. All of the articles are available via www.jstor.org and/or Scholar.Google.com. I have indicated on the course outline the readings that are required. A few items have, with the author's permission, been scanned and are available on the course website. Other items are recommended for this course, as well as for preparation for your comprehensive exams. Ordered books include:

- Fischel, William A. 2005. *The Homevoter Hypothesis: How Home Values Influence Local Government Taxation, School Finance, and Land-Use Policies*. Harvard University Press
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press.
- Hirt, Sonia. 2014. *Zoned in the USA: The Origins and Implications of American Land-Use Regulation*. Cornell University Press.
- Hopkins, Daniel. 2018. *The Increasingly United States: How and Why American Political Behavior Nationalized*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kettl, Donald F. 2020. *The Divided States of America: Why Federalism Doesn't Work*
- Kotkin, Joel. 2016. *The Human City: Urbanism for the Rest of Us*. Agate Publishers.

Course Outline

Week 1 (January 20) – Course Introduction

Required:

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2003. “Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-Level Governance.” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 2 (May), pp. 233-243.

Week 2 (January 27) – Theories of an American Compound Republic

Required:

Ostrom, Vincent. 1999. *The Meaning of American Federalism*. ICS Press. Selected chapters (these will be available in pdf form on Canvas)

Recommended:

Ostrom, Vincent. *The Political Theory of a Compound Republic: Designing the American Experiment*. 2d rev. ed..

Ostrom, Vincent and Barbara Allen. 2007. *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*, 3rd ed. University of Alabama Press.

Week 3 (February 3) – Failures of Federalism

Required:

Kettl, Donald F. 2020. *The Divided States of America: Why Federalism Doesn't Work*

Recommended:

Beer, Samuel H. 1993. *To Make a Nation: The Rediscovery of American Federalism*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Wilson, Woodrow. 1913. *The New Freedom A Call For the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People*. Double Day, Page and Company.

Croly, Herbert. 1909. *The Promise of American Life*.

Week 4 (February 10) – “Behavioral” Nationalization

Required:

Hopkins, Daniel. 2018. *The Increasingly United States: How and Why American Political Behavior Nationalized*. University of Chicago Press.

Recommended:

- Bishop, Bill. 2008. *The Big Sort: Why the Clustering of Like-Minded America Is Tearing Us Apart*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Chinni, Dante and James Gimpel. 2010. *Our Patchwork Nation: The Surprising Truth about the "Real" America*. Gotham Books.
- Fischer, David Hackett. 1989. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. Oxford University Press.
- Florida, Richard. 2012. *The Creative Class -- Revisited: 10th Anniversary Edition--Revised and Expanded*. Basic Books.
- Wolak, Jennifer, and Christine Kelleher Palus. 2010. "The Dynamics of Public Confidence in U.S. State and Local Government." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 10(4): 421-445.

Week 5 (February 17) – No Class (Wellness Day)**Week 6 (February 24) –Foundations of Polycentricity**

Required Readings:

- Tiebout, Charles M. 1956. "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures," *Journal of Political Economy* 64: 5 (October): 416-24.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press.
- Glaeser, Edward L. and Andrei Shleifer. 2005. The Curley Effect: The Economics of Shaping the Electorate." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, v. 21 n. 1, pp. 1-19.

Recommended:

- Dowding, Keith, Peter John and Stephen Biggs. 1994. "Tiebout: A Survey of the Empirical Literature." *Urban Studies* 31, pp. 767-97.
- John, Peter, Keith Dowding, and Stephen Biggs. 1995. "Residential Mobility in London: A Micro-Level Test of the Behavioural Foundations of the Tiebout Model." *British Journal of Political Science* 25: 3 (July), pp. 379-97.
- Craw, Michael. 2004. *Bringing the City Back In: Municipal Governments in U.S. Redistributive Policy*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Indiana University. Bloomington, IN.
- Hill, Kim Quaile, Jan E. Leighley, and Angela Hinton-Andersson. 1995. "Lower-Class Mobilization and Policy Linkage in the U.S. States." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 1. (February), pp. 75-86.
- Howard, Christopher. 1999. "The American Welfare State, or States?" *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 52, No. 2. (June), pp. 421-442.
- Miller, Nicholas R. 1983. "Pluralism and Social Choice," *American Political Science Review* 77 (September): 734-47.
- Peterson, Paul E. 1981. *City Limits*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press
- Peterson, Paul E. and Mark C. Rom. 1990. *Welfare Magnets: A Case for a National Standard*. Washington: Brookings.

- Peterson, Paul E. and Mark Rom. 1989. "American Federalism, Welfare Policy, and Residential Choices." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 83, No. 3. (September), pp. 711-728.
- Samuelson, Paul A. 1954. "The Pure Theory of Public Expenditure." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 36, No. 4. (Nov.), pp. 387-389.
- Schram, Sanford, Lawrence Nitz, and Gary Krueger. 1998. "Without Cause or Effect: Reconsidering Welfare Migration as a Policy Problem." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 42, No. 1. (January), pp. 210-230.
- Schram, Sanford F. and Gary Krueger. 1994. "Welfare Magnets and Benefit Decline: Symbolic Problems and Substantive Consequences," *Publius*, vol. 24 (Fall): 61-82.
- Shepsle, Kenneth and Mark Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Smith, Patricia K. 1991. "An Empirical Investigation of Interstate AFDC Benefit Competition," *Public Choice*, vol. 68, no. 3: 217-33.
- Soss, Joe, Sanford F. Schram, Thomas P. Vartanian, and Erin O'Brien. 2001. "Setting the Terms of Relief: Explaining State Policy Choices in the Devolution Revolution." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 45, No. 2. (April), pp. 378-395.
- Tweedie, Jack. 1994. "Resources Rather than Needs: A State-Centered Model of Welfare Policymaking," *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 38, no. 3 (August): 651-72.
- Weatherford, M. Stephen. 1980. "The Politics of School Busing: Contextual Effects and Community Polarization." *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 42, No. 3. (August), pp. 747-765.

Week 7 (March 3) – Self-Organizing Federalism

Required:

- Ostrom, Vincent, Charles M. Tiebout, and Robert Warren. 1961. "The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas: A Theoretical Inquiry." *American Political Science Review*, 55 (Dec.): 831-42.
- Feiock, Richard C. 2009. "Metropolitan governance and institutional collective action." *Urban Affairs Review* 44.3, pp. 356-377.
- Feiock, Richard and Sung-Wook Kwon. 2010. "Overcoming the Barriers to Cooperation: Intergovernmental Service Agreements," *Public Administration Review* 70 (6): 876-885.

Recommended:

- Salucci, Lapo and Kenneth Bickers. 2011. "Exit, Voice, and Electoral Turnover." *Urban Affairs Review* (March) vol. 47 no. 2 155-182.
- Teske, Paul, Mark Schneider, Michael Mintrom and Samuel Best. 1993. "Establishing the Micro Foundations of a Macro Theory: Information, Movers, and the Competitive Local Market for Public Goods." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 3. (September), pp. 702-713.
- Teske, Paul, Mark Schneider, Michael Mintrom, and Samuel Best. 1995. "Response." *American Political Science Review* 89: 3 (September), pp. 707-709.
- Bickers, Kenneth N. and Robert M. Stein. "The Micro Foundations of the Tiebout Model". *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 34, no. 1 (September, 1998): 76-93.

- Craw, Michael. 2010. "Deciding to Provide: Local Decisions on Providing Social Welfare," *American Journal of Political Science*. Volume 54, Issue 4, (October), pp. 906–920.
- Feiock, Richard and Manoj Shrestha. 2011. "Transaction Cost, Exchange Embeddedness and Interlocal Cooperation in Local Public Goods Supply," *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (3): 573-87.
- Feiock, Richard C. (Editor). 2004. *Metropolitan Governance: Conflict, Competition, and Cooperation*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Feiock, Richard C., and John T. Scholz, eds. 2010. *Self-organizing federalism: Collaborative mechanisms to mitigate institutional collective action dilemmas*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, James M. 1986. "The Decision to Contract Out: An Empirical Analysis," *Urban Affairs Quarterly* v. 22, no. 2, pp. 289-311.
- Hirsch, W. 1995. "Factors Important in Local Government's Privatization Decisions," *Urban Affairs Review* v. 30, no. 3, pp. 226-43.
- McGinnis, Michael D. 1999. *Polycentricity and Local Public Economies: Readings from the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- McGuire, R.A., R.L. Ohsfeldt, and T.N. Van Cott. 1987. "The Determinants of the Choice Between Public and Private Production of Publicly Funded Services," *Public Choice* v. 54, pp. 211-230.
- Minkoff, Scott. 2009. "Minding your Neighborhood: The Spatial Context of Local Redistribution." *Social Science Quarterly* v. 90 no. 3, pp. 516-537.
- Ostrom, E. 1983a. A Public Choice Approach to Metropolitan Institutions: Structure, Incentives, and Performance. *Social Science Journal* 20, no. 3: 79-96.
- Peterson, Paul, B.G. Rabe, and K.K. Wong. 1986. *When Federalism Works* (Washington, DC: Brookings).
- Post, Stephanie S. 2004. "Metropolitan area governance and institutional collective action." *Metropolitan governance: Conflict, competition, and cooperation*, pp. 67-92.
- Rudolph, Thomas J. 2003. "Institutional Context and the Assignment of Political Responsibility," *Journal of Politics* 65: 1 (February), pp. 190ff.
- Schneider, Mark, Paul Teske and Michael Mintrom. 1995. *Public Entrepreneurs: Agents for Change in American Government*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Schneider, Mark. 1985. "Suburban Fiscal Disparities and the Location Decisions of Firms." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 29, No. 3. (August), pp. 587-605.
- Stein, Robert. 1990. *Urban Alternatives : Public and Private Markets in the Provision of Local Services*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Week 8 (March 10) – Managing local governments in a federal system

Required:

- Agranoff, R. 2014. "Local governments in multilevel systems: Emergent public administration challenges." *The American Review of Public Administration*, 44(4_suppl), 47S-62S.
- Milward, H. Brinton and Keith G. Provan. 2000. "Governing the Hollow State." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* vol. 10 no. 2 (April): pp. 359-79.

- Provan, K.G. and Lemaire, R.H., 2012. "Core concepts and key ideas for understanding public sector organizational networks: Using research to inform scholarship and practice." *Public Administration Review*, 72(5), pp.638-648.
- Turrini, A., Cristofoli, D., Frosini, F., & Nasi, G. 2010. "Networking literature about determinants of network effectiveness." *Public Administration*, 88(2), 528-550.

Recommended:

- Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 1998. "Multinetwork Management: Collaboration and the Hollow State in Local Economic Policy," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8: 67-91.
- Deakin, Nicholas. 1996. "The Devils in the Detail: Some Reflections on Contracting for Social Care by Voluntary Organizations," *Social Policy and Administration* v. 30, no. 1 (March), pp. 20-38.
- DeHoog, Ruth Hoogland. 1984. *Contracting Out for Human Services: Economic, Political, and Organizational Perspectives*. Albany, NY: SUNY press.
- Hammack, David C.. 1989. "Private Organizations, Public Purposes: Nonprofits and their Archives," *Journal of American History*, 76: 1 (June): 181-91.
- Hansmann, Henry B. 1980. "The Role of the Nonprofit Enterprise," *Yale Law Journal* 89: 835-901.
- Kapucu, N., & Demiroz, F. 2011. "Measuring performance for collaborative public management using network analysis methods and tools." *Public Performance & Management Review*, 34(4), 549-579.
- McGuire, M., & Agranoff, R. 2011. "The limitations of public management networks." *Public Administration*, 89(2), 265-284.
- Milward, H. Brinton. 1996. "Symposium on the Hollow State: Capacity, Control, and Performance in Interorganizational Settings." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6, no. 2: 193-95.
- O'Connel, Brian. 1996. "A Major Transfer of Government Responsibility to Voluntary Organizations? Proceed with Caution," *Public Administration Review* v. 56, no. 3 (May/June): 222-225.
- O'Toole, Laurence J. 1997. "The Implications for Democracy in a Networked Bureaucratic World." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7: 443-59.
- O'Toole, Laurence J. 1997. "Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 57: 45-52.
- Peters, B. Guy. 1998. "Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8: 223-43.
- Provan, Keith and Patrick Kenis. 2007. "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness." *J. Public Adm. Res. Theory* (August 2): pp. 1-23.
- Scharpf, Fritz. 1993. "Coordination in Hierarchies and Networks," in *Games in Hierarchies and Networks: Analytical and Empirical Approaches to the Study of Governance Institutions*, Fritz W. Scharpf. Boulder: Westview.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1990. "Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 52, No. 2. (May), pp. 510-529.
- Smith, Steven Rathgeb and Michael Lipsky. 1993. *Nonprofits for Hire: The Welfare State in the Age of Contracting* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press).

- Starr, Paul. 1987. *The Limits of Privatization*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Warner, Mildred and Robert Hebdon. 2001. "Local Government Restructuring: Privatization and Its Alternatives," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, v. 20, no. 2, pp. 315-36.
- Weisbrod, Burton A. 1988. *The Nonprofit Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Week 9 (March 17) – Models of Urbanism: The Metropolis

Required: Kotkin, Joel. 2016. *The Human City: Urbanism for the Rest of Us*. Agate Publishers.

Recommended:

- Miller, David Y. and Raymond W. Cox III. 2015. *Governing the Metropolitan Region: America's New Frontier*. Routledge Press.
- Monkkonen, Erik H. 1988. *America Becomes Urban: The Development of U.S. Cities and Towns, 1780-1980*. University of California Press.
- Gamm, Gerald. 1999. *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed*. Harvard University Press.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*.
- Kotkins, Joel. 2007. *The City: A Global History*. Modern Library.
- Mumford, Lewis. 1968. *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects*. Mariner Books.
- Shefter, Martin. 1992. *Political Crisis/Fiscal Crisis*. Columbia University Press.
- Shefter, Martin. 1994. *Political Parties and the State: The American Historical Experience*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Week 10 (March 24) –Urban Theory

Required:

Orr, Marion and Valerie C. Johnson, eds. 2008. *Power in the City: Clarence Stone and the Politics of Inequality*. University Press of Kansas. Selected chapters. (These will be available in pdf form on Canvas).

Recommended:

- Judd, Dennis R. and Todd R. Swanstrom. 2011. *City Politics*, 8th Ed. Pearson.
- Stone, Clarence. 1989. *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. University Press of Kansas.
- Goetz, Edward and Susan Clarke. 1993. *The new localism: Comparative urban politics in a global era*. Sage.
- Dahl, Robert. 2005. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*, 2d ed. Yale University Press.

Week 11 (March 31) – Dynamics of Local Politics

Required:

Fischel, William A. 2005. *The Homevoter Hypothesis: How Home Values Influence Local Government Taxation, School Finance, and Land-Use Policies*. Harvard University Press

Recommended:

- Bickers, Kenneth and Richard Engstrom. 2006. "Tiebout Sorting in Metropolitan Areas." *Review of Policy Research* 23 (6): pp. 1181–1198.
- Craw, Michael. 2008. "Taming the Local Leviathan: Institutional and Economic Constraints on Municipal Budgets," *Urban Affairs Review* vol. 43 no. 5 (May) pp. 663-690.
- Kelleher, Christine and David Lowery. 2004. "Political Participation and Metropolitan Institutional Contexts." *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 39, No. 6 (July): pp. 720-757.
- Lowery, David, W.E. Lyons, and Ruth Hoogland DeHoog. 1995. "The Empirical Evidence for Citizen Information and Local Market for Public Goods." *American Political Science Review* 89: 3 (September), pp. 705-707.
- Lyons, William E. and David Lowery. 1989. "Governmental Fragmentation vs. Consolidation: Five Public Choice Myths About Creating Informed, Involved, and Happy Citizens." *Public Administration Review*. 49 (November/December): 533-543.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Harvard University Press.
- Neiman, M. 1976. "The social stratification-government inequality thesis explored." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 19:91-112.
- Oakerson, Ronald J. 1999. *Governing Local Public Economies: Creating the Civic Metropolis*. Oakland, CA: ICS Press.
- Schneider, Mark, Paul Teske, Melissa Marshall, and Christine Roch. 1998. "Shopping for Schools: In the Land of the Blind, The One-Eyed Parent May be Enough." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 42, No. 3. (July), pp. 769-793.

Week 12 (April 7) – Local Politics: Is America Exceptional?

Required:

Hirt, Sonia. 2014. *Zoned in the USA: The Origins and Implications of American Land-Use Regulation*. Cornell University Press.

Recommended:

- Burns, Nancy. 1994. *The Formation of American Local Governments: Private Values in Public Institutions* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press).
- Einstein, Katherine Levine, David M. Glick, and Maxwell Palmer. 2019. *Neighborhood Defenders: Participatory Politics and America's Housing Crisis*. Cambridge University Press

Weeks 13-14 – Consultations on Research Proposals

Literature reviews due Monday, April 12, by 10 pm, to Canvas dropbox.

Each student should plan one or more consultations with me between April 14 and April 21

Week 15 – Half-Day Conference – Sunday, April 25

Drafts of Research Proposals to be presented at Half-Day Conference, 11:00 a.m.- 3:00 p.m., at the Bickers home (if in-person without distancing permitted; otherwise via zoom). If permitted by Covid-19 rules, lunch provided.

Research Proposals Due –Wednesay, April 28 (10:00 pm)